



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 September 2019

by Ben Plenty BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/W/19/3233101

Hangar 88, Hullavington, Wiltshire SN14 6GU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr B Guloglu against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref 18/09251/FUL, dated 21 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 11 January 2019.
 - The development proposed is retention of static food van.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The structure has already been installed and is in use. I will consider the appeal on that basis.
3. The appellant has submitted amended plans in support of the appeal. These show the addition of vertical timber boarding to the van. However, the appeal should not be used to evolve a scheme. The alteration would create a materially different scheme, I will therefore not consider them as part of this appeal.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Hullavington Airbase Conservation Area (CA), and
 - whether the proposed development would be in a suitable location to accord with local and national sustainable transport objectives.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The site, the subject of this appeal, is within the forecourt of a large aircraft hangar. The hangar has a grass covered curved roof that touches the ground on both sides. It sits amongst other similar structures on a former airbase. It is a utilitarian structure and now repurposed for indoor karting use. The site is within a corner of the former airbase in the open countryside. There is limited tree and bush screening on the boundaries to the site. It is particularly exposed on the southern boundary. Consequently, the site is prominent and highly

- visible from the two adjacent highways. The site makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
6. The proposal is for the retention of a food van located in front of the hangar. It consists of two smaller structures connected into one structure. It is flat roofed, has prefabricated wall panels and is simple in form.
 7. The National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) considers the impact of a proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset. It requires that great weight is to be given to an asset's conservation¹. Furthermore, the statutory requirements² require that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the CA.
 8. The significance of the CA derives from its military history and arrangement of aircraft related buildings across the site. Whilst being built for primarily functional use, the hangars nevertheless have a certain grace of simplicity. The hangars therefore create a strong and positive presence on the site. The van is in a prominent location, both highly visible from the public realm and stark in contrast to the graceful lines of the large hangar behind. Therefore, whilst being of relatively minor proportions, the structure is prominent on the frontage and is an anomalous addition to the historical context. Furthermore, whilst I have not formally considered the revised cladding, cosmetic changes to the building would be unlikely to remedy these concerns. The proposal would therefore harm the character and appearance of the conservation area.
 9. The harm to the conservation area would be 'less than substantial' affecting only its immediate surroundings. Paragraph 196 of the Framework sets out the need to address 'less than substantial harm' in a balanced manner against any public benefits associated with such schemes. The proposal would provide amenity to users of the adjacent karting facility, creating economic activity and some employment. However, these limited benefits would be insufficient to outweigh the identified harm to the character and appearance of the Hullavington Airbase CA.
 10. Accordingly, the proposal would not accord with core policy 58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy 2015 (CS), which requires development to protect, conserve and where possible enhance the historic environment. Furthermore, the proposal would be contrary to the Framework which seeks to sustain and enhance the significance of heritage assets.

Suitable location

11. The van provides a catering function for members of the public. Core policy 60 of the CS seeks to reduce the need to travel especially by private car. It seeks to achieve this through the promotion of public transport and planning development in accessible locations. The site is relatively isolated and likely to attract mostly car borne visitors. Furthermore, the site has limited access to public transport.
12. The appellant explains that the business stemmed from customer demand for refreshment while attending the adjacent facility. However, he has not explained why such a service could not be provided from within the facility. Furthermore, even if most business is derived from the adjacent karting centre,

¹ National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 193

² Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

this could not be regulated by condition and could change over time. The site is located adjacent to the A429. Consequently, whilst the existing karting business attracts trade to the area, the van has the capability to attract a significant level of independent passing trade. This is of greater likelihood being in a prominent location and adjacent to the highway.

13. Furthermore, paragraph 84 of the Framework recognises that some sites that seek to meet local business and community needs may be in rural areas. However, it also explains that such development should be sensitive to its surroundings. This is also not without regard to other objectives of the Development Plan and Framework.
14. As such, the proposal would be contrary to core policy 60 of the CS, that seeks to reduce the need to travel particularly by private car, by planning development in accessible locations. Furthermore, the proposal would be contrary to the Framework as it would not be sensitively located.

Other matters

15. The appellant explains that the proposal meets many objectives of the Development Plan. However, satisfying policies in regard to retail impact, ecology, drainage, flood risk, highway safety and residential living conditions can only afford a neutral contribution towards the planning balance.

Conclusion

16. For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

Ben Plenty

INSPECTOR